United Nations A/55/69–S/2000/378

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
4 May 2000
English
Original: Russian

General Assembly
Fifty-fifth session
Items 29, 33, 39, 74 (p), 94 and 96 of the preliminary list*

Cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe

Culture of peace

Support by the United Nations system of the efforts of Governments to promote and consolidate new or restored democracies

General and complete disarmament: regional disarmament

Macroeconomic policy questions

Sustainable development and international economic cooperation

Security Council
Fifty-fifth year

Letter dated 2 May 2000 from the Permanent Representatives of Azerbaijan and Georgia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

On instructions from our Governments, we have the honour to transmit the text of a joint statement issued by the Presidents of Georgia and Azerbaijan during the visit of the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan to Georgia from 22 to 23 March 2000 (see annex).

We should be grateful if you would have the text of this letter and its annex circulated as a document of the fifty-fifth session of the General Assembly, under agenda items 29, 33, 39, 74 (p), 94 and 96 of the preliminary list, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Eldar **Kouliev**
Permanent Representative of the Republic of Azerbaijan to the United Nations

(*Signed*) Peter **Chkheidze**
Permanent Representative of Georgia to the United Nations

* A/55/50.

00-41890 (E) 110500 120500

Annex to the letter dated 2 May 2000 from the Permanent Representatives of Azerbaijan and Georgia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Joint statement

At the invitation of E. Shevardnadze, President of Georgia, H. Aliyev, President of the Republic of Azerbaijan, paid an official visit to Georgia from 22 to 23 March 2000.

During the talks which were held and the exchange of views on the political, economic and social processes that had taken place in their countries, the Parties discussed questions relating to the further development and intensification of bilateral cooperation and current regional and international problems that were of mutual interest.

The Parties noted with satisfaction the high level of bilateral relations between the two States, based on a strategic partnership.

The Parties emphasized their mutual interest in the building of the independent sovereign democratic States of Georgia and Azerbaijan, in accordance with international legal standards, including the development of a qualitatively new level of intergovernmental relations in the twenty-first century.

The Parties reaffirmed the historical need for the building of a Europe without dividing lines in the twenty-first century.

The Parties noted the growing significance of the strengthening of cooperation between Georgia and Azerbaijan in the conditions of the new international reality with a view to ensuring a basis of stability and promoting the process of the establishment of a new system of security in the region.

The Parties expressed their confidence that the pledge of peace and security in the South Caucasus region was in keeping with the principles of State sovereignty, equality of rights, territorial integrity, the inviolability of frontiers, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, the peaceful settlement of disputes and other generally recognized standards of international law.

The Parties condemned acts of aggression, aggressive separatism and terrorism in all their forms and manifestations which were aimed at bringing about a violent change in the internationally recognized frontiers of the States of the region, threatened the territorial integrity and security of States and undermined human fundamental rights and freedoms, the principles of democracy and the values common to all mankind, and expressed the wish to develop cooperation to combat such threats.

It was noted that the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Strengthening of Mutual Security between the Republic of Azerbaijan and Georgia of 8 March 1996, the Declaration on Peace, Security and Cooperation in the Caucasus Region, signed at Tbilisi on 8 March 1996 and the Declaration on the Further Strengthening of Strategic Cooperation between the Republic of Azerbaijan and Georgia of 18 February 1997 provided a solid foundation for mutual relations and could serve as a basis for a basic document aimed at ensuring security and peace in the South Caucasus. The Parties greatly valued the proposal put forward by H. Aliyev,

President of the Republic of Azerbaijan, at the Istanbul Summit of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) regarding a security and cooperation pact for the South Caucasus, as well as the results of the Istanbul Summit of OSCE, and they emphasized the significance of the Charter on European Security and other documents adopted during that meeting which were aimed at the strengthening of security and stability in Europe in the twenty-first century.

The Parties expressed their readiness to continue their cooperation in the future within the United Nations, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, the Council of Europe, the Commonwealth of Independent States and other international organizations and forums, and reaffirmed that the effectiveness of the new European security structure would depend above all on proper compliance by all States with the obligations they had undertaken and the establishment of mechanisms for interaction between OSCE, the Council of Europe, the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, the European Union, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the United Nations.

The Parties reaffirmed the need for the speedy implementation of the decisions of the United Nations and OSCE and of other documents adopted within those organizations on the Nagorny Karabakh conflict and the conflict in Abkhazia. The Parties expressed their strong confidence that the settlement of those conflicts should be based on respect for and maintenance of sovereignty, territorial integrity and the inviolability of frontiers, since such a settlement would provide a reliable guarantee for the attainment of peace, stability and trust between the States of the South Caucasus.

The Parties expressed satisfaction at the expansion and intensification of cooperation within GUUAM and reaffirmed their intention to improve and strengthen mechanisms for continuing consultation and interaction.

The Parties noted the extreme importance of implementing joint practical measures with a view to expediting the large-scale functioning of the Europe-Asia transport corridor, the restoration of the Great Silk Route and the implementation of the programmes for the Transport Corridor — Europe-Caucasus-Asia (TRACECA) and the Interstate Oil and Gas Transmission to Europe (INOGATE).

During the talks, the Presidents agreed definitively on all the main questions of principle on the construction and entry into operation of the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan oil pipeline as the main export pipeline for the transport of oil from the Caspian region, including questions relating to transit tariffs, and they reaffirmed their readiness to complete the preparation of all the necessary documents in April 2000.

The Parties expressed their interest in the all-round development and intensification of the Trans-Caspian process of cooperation in the transport of fuel to international markets.

The Presidents gave a positive evaluation of the development of the Organization of Black Sea Economic Cooperation and stressed the importance of the steps taken towards the institutional strengthening of that organization.

The Parties once again expressed their adherence to democratic reforms, the protection of human rights, respect for the rights of national minorities and the implementation of all the obligations arising out of the basic documents of the

United Nations and OSCE and stressed their resolve to build democratic States ruled by law.

The Parties noted the importance of the delimitation and demarcation of the State frontier between Georgia and the Republic of Azerbaijan and reaffirmed the need to continue the work of the State commissions.

The Parties expressed support for the efforts to develop and intensify cooperation on matters relating to labour, social welfare, education, science and culture and comprehensive exchanges in those areas.

The Parties reaffirmed their determination to collaborate in the development of mutually advantageous cooperation in all spheres of the economy and to take measures to ensure favourable conditions for such cooperation.

The Parties once again reaffirmed that they attached great significance to questions relating to the maintenance of the rights and protection of the interests of Azerbaijanis living in Georgia and of Georgians living in Azerbaijan and that they regarded concern for them as a priority area of State policy.

After giving a positive evaluation of the results of the visit and having noted the fruitful character of the talks, the Parties declared that it was their aim to continue and increase cooperation in a spirit of good-neighbourliness, friendship and mutual assistance.

Done at Tbilisi, on 22 March 2000, in two original copies, each in the Azerbaijani, Georgian and Russian languages, all texts being equally authentic.

(*Signed*) H. **Aliyev**
President of the Republic of Azerbaijan

(*Signed*) E. **Shevardnadze**
President of Georgia

United Nations S/2000/379

Security Council

Distr.: General
4 May 2000
English
Original: French

Letter dated 3 May 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Côte d'Ivoire to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to transmit herewith a communication containing our comments on the final report of the Panel of Experts established by the Security Council pursuant to resolution 1237 (1999) of 7 May 1999, which was issued on 10 March 2000 under the symbol S/2000/203.

I should be extremely grateful if you would have the above-mentioned communication circulated as a document of the Security Council under the item on the situation in Angola.

(*Signed*) Claude **Bouah-Kamon**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

00-41783 (E) 040500 040500

Annex to the letter dated 3 May 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Côte d'Ivoire to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

On instructions from my Government, following the publication on 10 March 2000 of the report of the independent Panel of Experts to investigate violations of the Security Council sanctions against UNITA (S/2000/203), I have the honour to inform you as follows:

The relations between Côte d'Ivoire and UNITA are a consequence of the cold war.

If the Ivorian Government has continued to maintain close relations with the UNITA authorities, this has been to some extent at the request of the Government in Luanda, with which Côte d'Ivoire enjoys excellent diplomatic relations at the level of ambassadors. Côte d'Ivoire has long served as an intermediary to facilitate contacts between the two parties to the conflict.

However, following the signing of the Lusaka agreements and the failure of UNITA to respect their provisions, the Government of Côte d'Ivoire decided to freeze its relations with Mr. Savimbi's organization.

Paragraphs 122, 142 and 143 of the report contain specific accusations against Côte d'Ivoire.

Even though the National Committee for Public Salvation and the Government of Transition which rule Côte d'Ivoire have not deemed it appropriate since the publication of the report to react officially to the allegations of the Panel of Experts concerning the purported "illegal" relations that exist between Côte d'Ivoire and UNITA, this silence does not mean that they accept the allegations contained in the report or that they attach no importance to the question of Angola and, in particular, to the suffering of the fraternal people of that nation.

Our delay in reacting must be viewed in the light of the new circumstances that have existed in Côte d'Ivoire since the political events of 24 December 1999, which have led to significant changes in the political situation.

In the light of these new realities, the authorities of Côte d'Ivoire considered that it was necessary to take sufficient time to carefully study the contents of the report of the Panel of Experts covering the period from 1993 to 1998.

Since the Panel of Experts has highlighted the relations that existed between President Bedié and UNITA during this period, the current authorities of Côte d'Ivoire find it difficult to understand the statement contained in the report that "however, the current military leadership in Abidjan is said to be close to Savimbi and very sympathetic to UNITA. UNITA supporters have reacted very positively to the arrival of the new regime" (para. 142).

On what basis can it be claimed that the military leadership which has taken power in Abidjan is close to Savimbi and very sympathetic to UNITA?

Is it necessary to recall that it was the same military leadership which, on 24 December 1999, overthrew President Bedié and his regime because it strongly disagreed with the way in which Côte d'Ivoire was being managed? Need we also

recall that the majority of these military figures were not in positions of authority under the regime of the deposed President?

The National Committee for Public Salvation and the Government of Transition consider that the question of Angola is too serious to be treated lightly on the basis of broad allegations that leave doubts in the minds of many, including the Panel of Experts, which has recognized, notably in paragraph 143, that the "Panel was unable fully to confirm the information relating to Vansco Air Freight, but believes that future investigation is warranted."

The authorities of Côte d'Ivoire wish to underscore the patently dangerous nature of the allegations contained in paragraph 142. In terms of its grammatical structure, the Panel of Experts uses the impersonal form in support of its accusation. In fact, the sentence in question uses the words "is said to be". Upon closer examination, the use of this impersonal form shows that the Panel of Experts is not itself convinced about what "is said" and, let us state it clearly, "peddled". And yet, on this basis, it makes accusations against a State Member of the United Nations. The Government of Côte d'Ivoire considers this approach to be damaging to the credibility of the United Nations.

With regard to paragraph 143, apart from the fact that this paragraph also makes extensive use of the impersonal form ("is said to", etc.), the allegations of the Panel of Experts raise the following questions:

How does the fact that a foreign national, even one close to Mr. Savimbi, whose wife is a national of Côte d'Ivoire and a member of one of the prominent families of that country and who is himself very well known in the circles of power and moves in high social circles in Abidjan constitute a violation of Security Council sanctions?

If one marries a person who is a member of a prominent family, it is logical that the two spouses would move in high social circles together with other prominent families. How do such a marriage and the fact of moving in such circles constitute a crime or a violation of United Nations sanctions?

On the question of the Vansco Air Freight company of Mr. Kakumba, the corporate name, which is well known, should have been published. Does that name appear in the business register of Côte d'Ivoire?

What concrete evidence is there to suggest that it is "involved in the transport of arms and other equipment to UNITA"? And what is the specific nature of this "other equipment"?

If the Panel of Experts was unable "fully" to confirm the information relating to Vansco Air Freight, what at least is the partial information that it has?

The authorities of Côte d'Ivoire also wish to point out that, unless there is tangible proof of collusion between the new authorities and UNITA, of which, moreover, Côte d'Ivoire would like to be informed, the notion of "credible evidence" would seem to lack any basis.

This credibility is evident only to the authors, who should have named the source of the information received. Is the source close to UNITA or to the authorities of Côte d'Ivoire?

Concerning the relations between the deposed President Henri Konan Bedié and Mr. Savimbi with respect to the "money .... to be used for UNITA purposes and for the upkeep of Savimbi's immediate and extended family in Côte d'Ivoire" (para. 122), the report should have stated the amounts, dates on which the money was deposited, the numbers of the bank accounts into which they were deposited, and so on.

In any event, the Government of Côte d'Ivoire considers that the report of the Panel of Experts (S/2000/203) suffers from a lack of evidence and contains only gratuitous assertions that cast doubt on its objectivity.

In this new century and following the events of 24 December 1999, Côte d'Ivoire intends to promote national reconciliation and to strengthen its ties to the United Nations and to all fraternal countries, including Angola.

It also wishes to cooperate, in a spirit of transparency, with the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) concerning the situation in Angola. In order to make its actions more effective, it would welcome any information that might not have come to its attention and which must surely be available to the Panel of Experts.

In any case, the various measures already taken or to be taken by Côte d'Ivoire in observance of the sanctions against UNITA will be immediately brought through you to the attention of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Claude **Bouah-Kamon**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

United Nations S/2000/380

Security Council

Distr.: General
4 May 2000

Original: English

Letter dated 4 May 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Sierra Leone to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

Upon the instructions of my Government, I have the honour to transmit the attached document, entitled "Passage of motion" in which the members of Parliament of the Republic of Sierra Leone have issued a 15-point resolution following the mounting attacks on the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) forces.

I would be grateful if the present letter and its annex could be issued as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Ibrahim M. **Kamara**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

00-41741 (E) 040500

Annex to the letter dated 4 May 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Sierra Leone to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

Certificate

Passage of motion

Private Member's motion

Proposer: Hon. A. O. Bangura
Seconder: Hon. Dr. Raymond S. Kamara

Be it resolved:

That Members of the House of Parliament:

1. Express serious concern over the resumption of hostilities by forces of the RUF and consider such hostilities as a breach of the ceasefire agreement signed in Lomé on 18 May 1999 and the Peace Agreement signed in Lomé on 7 July 1999.

2. Deplore in the strongest terms the current attacks on UNAMSIL forces and other acts of banditry, indiscipline, destruction and molestation consistently taken by the RUF against UNAMSIL since the arrival of the forces in Sierra Leone.

3. Regard the breach of the two agreements and the perpetration of hostilities against UNAMSIL as criminal acts for which the leadership of the RUF should be brought to justice by the international tribunal for crimes against humanity.

4. Deeply regret casualties and any loss of life.

5. Forcefully demand the immediate release of any UNAMSIL forces and other United Nations and international personnel, as well as any civilians detained by the RUF.

6. Call on the RUF leadership to immediately instruct its fighters to stop the fighting and refrain from further perpetration of criminal acts against UNAMSIL forces and innocent civilians in their areas of operation.

7. Commend UNAMSIL troops and Force Commander General Jetley for their courage and heroic comportment to bring the situation under control.

8. Pledge the full support of Members of Parliament and the people of Sierra Leone for the continued efforts being made to resolve the crisis.

9. Members of Parliament further call on the Government of Sierra Leone to:

   - Mobilize the entire populace and put all resources at its disposal, including military, police, paramilitary and civilian volunteers to stand firm by the side of UNAMSIL in their efforts to bring this crisis to an immediate end.

   - Put Mr. Foday Sankoh immediately under house arrest and restrict the movement of RUF Ministers of Government and all other official appointees of the RUF until such time as the hostilities have come to an end.

- Ensure that guns are removed from all combatants within 45 days from today and make it a serious criminal offence for anyone to be found in unlawful possession of a weapon or for unlawfully keeping a weapon in his premises.
- Remove all ex-combatants from those parts of the country they now illegally occupy and administer.
- Restore normal authority of government throughout the country.

10. That Parliament:

- Enact legislation suspending some of the privileges accorded to Mr. Foday Sankoh and other elements of the RUF by virtue of the Lomé Peace Agreement ratified by Parliament until such time as they show genuine commitment to the peace process.
- Invite Mr. Foday Sankoh to Parliament to explain the circumstances leading to the attacks on UNAMSIL forces in Kailahun, Magburaka and Makeni which are all tantamount to violations of his obligations under the Lomé Agreement.
- Hold the leadership of those responsible for further acts of violence against innocent citizens and other criminal acts of banditry, harassment and molestation of civilians liable and accountable to the international war crimes tribunal.

11. That Parliament further call on UNAMSIL to:

- Forcefully disarm all combatants that are unwilling to hand in their guns and participate in the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme within a period of 45 days.
- Institute cordon-and-search exercises throughout the city of Freetown, and its environs, as well as provincial headquarters, particularly in areas with unusual concentration of ex-combatants.
- Strictly enforce curfew hours and severely limit permits for street marches, parades, demonstrations and night vigils and the like until security is assured throughout the country.

12. That Parliament call on all citizens of Sierra Leone to:

- Join Members of Parliament in registering their profound revulsion at the continued violations of the Lomé Peace Agreement by the RUF.
- Cooperate with one another in isolating Mr. Foday Sankoh until he and his supporters show remorse for the hurt, harm and grievous damage they have done to their country.

13. As the series of coordinated attacks against UNAMSIL troops in various parts of the country are viewed as an indication that Mr. Foday Sankoh and his supporters are not interested in peace but are committed to derailing the peace process and seizing power by force,

That Members of Parliament, therefore, call upon the Moral guarantors, especially President Charles Taylor, President Blaise Campaore and President Kadaffi to use their influence and good offices to prevail on Mr. Foday Sankoh to respect the Lomé Peace Agreement.

14. That Parliament strongly enjoin Mr. Foday Sankoh to respect the commitment he has just made to the visiting Nigerian delegation to uphold the provisions of the Lomé Agreement.

15. Finally, that Members of Parliament call on the United Nations to invoke Article 7 of the rules of engagement authorizing UNAMSIL to use force when necessary.

Passed unanimously by a collection of voices this fourth day of May in the year of our Lord two thousand.

Certified by the Clerk of Parliament

J. A. **Carpenter**
Clerk of Parliament

United Nations S/2000/381

Security Council

Distr.: General
4 May 2000

Original: English

Letter dated 4 May 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

We would like to add our voice to those who have expressed concern about the recent public visit with Slobodan Milosevic of two ambassadors from the Security Council while on a fact-finding mission to Kosovo. This has more than a tangential interest for Bosnia and Herzegovina. First, progressive, democratic change in our region is essential, and in particular with respect to the situation in Belgrade. Second, the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia is recognized by the Dayton Peace Accords and our Constitution, the supreme institution of justice within Bosnia and Herzegovina. Any marginalization of the Tribunal also means an undermining of the principles of justice, legality and democracy in our country as well as in the region as a whole.

However, it is not our intention to condemn or rhetoricalize the actions of our two colleagues from the Security Council. Rather, we would like to encourage a dialogue to help develop the appropriate standards of protocol and political symbolism for this and similar situations that may challenge or pose a dilemma for individuals and international institutions.

Mr. Milosevic has been indicted by the Tribunal. As an individual, he remains to be convicted or exonerated. The problem is that Mr. Milosevic continues to ignore the legal demands of the Security Council and the Tribunal established by it. By extension, he also denies the principles and legal norms of the United Nations. This is also a commitment of the Dayton Peace Accords, to which Mr. Milosevic has added his signature. We believe that there is something inappropriate, in terms of both substance and appearance, in extending to Mr. Milosevic any of the privileges normally accorded to leaders and representatives of States. Granting Mr. Milosevic legitimacy can and does have the effect of undermining the credibility of the Tribunal. It also has the impact of weakening support for legality and the Dayton Peace Accords, which, again, were also endorsed by the Security Council.

Therefore, we would like to encourage a debate within the Security Council and ultimately the adoption of standards of appropriate protocol in dealing with individuals who by words and/or deeds deny the authority of the Tribunal and, by extension, the Security Council and the United Nations as a whole. Mr. Milosevic clearly falls into this unfortunate class, and did so even before his indictment, by failing to heed the numerous demands of the Security Council to deliver other

00-41842 (E) 050500

persons who had been indicted by the Tribunal who were openly shielded by living in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro).

As an example, we would ask that the following norms of protocol and behaviour be considered (certain similar codes of standards were implicitly adopted in the period before, during and after the negotiations on the Dayton Peace Accords):

1. Minimize formal contacts of indicted persons (and others denying the authority of the Tribunal and the Security Council) with the representatives of the United Nations and Member States and avoid public and symbolic appearances;

2. Any formal or informal meeting should include a clear statement that the offending personality is obliged to cooperate with the Tribunal (and in the future the International Criminal Court) and the Security Council;

3. Deny the normal privileges of protocol that would otherwise be accorded to the political office associated with the offending personality;

4. None of this prejudges guilt or innocence, but addresses a clear failure to cooperate and heed.

This debate and appropriate standards are necessary now for the existing Tribunals. However, soon we must engage in order to define the terms of interaction between the International Criminal Court and the various institutions of the United Nations, in particular the Security Council. We are concerned that the present letter will initially be viewed by some in the Security Council as a rebuke. However, it is a request for dialogue and standards before we and our common international institutions become legally blurred, politically irrelevant and lacking in credibility with respect to the most recent challenges to international peace and security, both in our eyes and in those of the global public.

May I ask for your kind assistance in circulating the present letter as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Muhamed **Sacirbey**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

United Nations S/2000/382

Security Council

Distr.: General
4 May 2000
English
Original: Arabic

Identical letters dated 3 May 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and to the President of the Security Council

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a letter dated 2 May 2000 from Mr. Mohammed Said Al-Sahaf, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq, concerning the acts of armed aggression carried out by American forces and Kuwaiti authorities on 18 and 20 April 2000 respectively against Iraqi seamen and vessels within Iraqi territorial waters, and reaffirming Iraq's inherent right to take the necessary measures to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity and its territorial waters, and to demand compensation for these aggressive acts.

I should be grateful if you would have this letter and its annex distributed as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Saeed **Hasan**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

00-41861 (E) 050500 050500

Annex to the identical letters dated 3 May 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and to the President of the Security Council

I wish to inform you that at 0230 hours on 18 April 2000, the Honduran ship *Factory/2* was subjected to an act of piracy by American naval launches in the vicinity of the port of Bakar, when a number of their crew members boarded the ship and seized it, and at 0900 hours led it away with its crew of 11 towards an unknown destination.

At 2300 hours on 20 April 2000, two Kuwaiti naval patrol boats, each with a crew of nine, wearing uniforms and armed with pistols, intercepted the launch *Zahra* in the area of Bubiyan Al-Khadir close to Khawr Abd Allah and attacked the 13 members of the crew. Uttering curses and insults, the assailants struck them with sticks and confiscated their fishing licences and service records and the launch logbook, and as a result of the attack some of the seamen suffered serious bruises.

Such incursions by American forces and Kuwaiti authorities into our territorial waters and the attack on Iraqi seamen within those waters constitute a glaring breach of the integrity and sovereignty of Iraq and an act of armed aggression which, under the most basic norms of international relations, is a blatant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of the principles of international law and prevailing international customs, all of which uphold renunciation of the threat or use of force against the security and independence of any State. In protesting against this aggressive conduct of American forces and Kuwaiti authorities, we demand that you intervene to put an end to such transgressions represented by the incursions into Iraqi territorial waters and the provocative acts in question. The Government of the Republic of Iraq reserves its full and inherent right, as provided for in the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of international law and customs, to take the necessary measures to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity and its territorial waters, and to demand compensation for the mental harm and material damage resulting from these aggressive acts, in conformity with the principle of international responsibility.

(*Signed*) Mohammed Said **Al-Sahaf**
Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq

United Nations S/2000/383

Security Council

Distr.: General
4 May 2000
English
Original: Arabic

Identical letters dated 3 May 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and to the President of the Security Council

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a letter dated 2 May 2000 addressed to you by Mr. Mohammed Said Al-Sahaf, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq, concerning the continuing overt aggression by the United States of America and the United Kingdom against Iraq. During the period from 16 to 28 April 2000, United States and British military aircraft carried out a total of 289 hostile sorties, including 154 from Saudi Arabia, 77 from Kuwait and 58 from Turkey. The letter also reaffirms Iraq's inalienable right to defend the inviolability of its territory and to seek compensation for the damage caused by this aggression.

I should be grateful if you would have this letter and its annex distributed as a document of the Security Council.

Accept, Sir, the assurances of my highest consideration.

(*Signed*) Saeed **Hasan**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

00-41854 (E) 080500 080500

Annex to the identical letters dated 3 May 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to inform you that, between 16 and 28 April 2000, United States and British military aircraft, taking off from their bases in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Turkey, continued to violate Iraqi airspace, carrying out a total of 289 aerial sorties, of which 154 were from Saudi Arabia, 77 from Kuwait and 58 from Turkey. The details are given below:

1. *The northern region*: 58 sorties were flown at speeds of 720 to 780 kilometres per hour and at altitudes of 6,000 to 12,000 metres:

(a) At 1100 hours on 16 April 2000, United States and British F-14, F-15, F-16, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Turkish territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the northern region. Supported by an AWACS command and control aircraft from inside Turkish airspace, they carried out 16 sorties, overflying the Dohuk, Amadiyah, Tall Afar, Mosul, Aqrah, Irbil and Sinjar areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 1405 hours, drove them off.

(b) At 1100 hours on 17 April 2000, United States and British F-14, F-15, F-16, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Turkish territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the northern region. Supported by an AWACS command and control aircraft from inside Turkish airspace, they carried out 22 sorties, overflying the Dohuk, Zakho, Ayn Zalah, Rawandoz, Amadiyah, Mosul, Aqrah, Irbil and Sinjar areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 1340 hours, drove them off.

(c) At 1045 hours on 25 April 2000, United States and British F-14, F-15, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Turkish territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the northern region. Supported by an AWACS command and control aircraft from inside Turkish airspace, they carried out 16 sorties, overflying the Dohuk, Amadiyah, Tall Afar, Mosul, Aqrah, Zakho and Sinjar areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 1350 hours, drove them off.

2. *The southern region*: 231 sorties were flown at speeds of 720 to 780 kilometres per hour and at altitudes of 9,000 to 13,000 metres:

(a) At 2050 hours on 17 April 2000, United States and British F-15 aircraft coming from Saudi and Kuwaiti territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They carried out eight sorties, supported by an AWACS command and control aircraft from inside Saudi airspace. The aircraft overflew the Taqtaqanah, southern Samawah and Ushbayjah areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 2115 hours, drove them off.

(b) At 2220 hours on 18 April 2000, United States and British F-14, F-15, F-16, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Saudi and Kuwaiti territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They carried out 30 sorties, 24 from Saudi airspace and six from Kuwaiti airspace, supported by an AWACS command and control aircraft from inside Saudi airspace. The aircraft overflew the Ukhaydir, Salman, Jalibah, Rifa'i, Qal'at Sukkar, Diwaniyah, Nasiriyah, Qarnah and

Samawah areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 2330 hours, drove them off.

(c) At 1640 hours on 22 April 2000, United States and British F-14, F-15 and Tornado aircraft coming from Saudi and Kuwaiti territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They carried out 20 sorties, 16 from Saudi airspace and four from Kuwaiti airspace, supported by an AWACS command and control aircraft from inside Saudi airspace. The aircraft overflew the Taqtaqanah, Salman, Busayyah, Jalibah, Hayy, Diwaniyah, Basra, Nasiriyah, Qurnah, Samawah and Amarah areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 1815 hours, drove them off.

(d) At 1150 hours on 24 April 2000, United States and British F-14, F-15, F-16, F-18, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Saudi and Kuwaiti territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They carried out 34 sorties, 16 from Saudi airspace, supported by an AWACS command and control aircraft from inside Saudi airspace, and 18 from Kuwaiti airspace, supported by an E2-C command and control aircraft from inside Kuwaiti airspace. The aircraft overflew the Salman, Nasiriyah, Qurnah, Diwaniyah, Amarah, Rumaythah, Nukhayb, Basra, Najaf, Samawah and Qal'at Salih areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 1500 hours, drove them off.

(e) At 1050 hours on 25 April 2000, United States and British F-14, F-15, F-16, F-18, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Saudi and Kuwaiti territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They carried out 45 sorties, 28 from Saudi airspace and 17 from Kuwaiti airspace, supported by an AWACS command and control aircraft from inside Saudi airspace. The aircraft overflew the Taqtaqanah, Salman, Jalibah, Hayy, Artawi, Lasaf, Qal'at Sukkar, Najaf, Diwaniyah, Basra, Nasiriyah, Qurnah, Samawah and Amarah areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 1210 hours, drove them off.

(f) At 1000 hours on 26 April 2000, United States and British F-14, F-15, F-16, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Saudi and Kuwaiti territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They carried out 16 sorties, eight from Saudi airspace and eight from Kuwaiti airspace, supported by an AWACS command and control aircraft from inside Saudi airspace. The aircraft overflew the Shatrah, Salman, Jalibah, Safwan, Artawi, Rifa'i, Qurnah, Amarah, Qal'at Sukkar, Najaf, Shinafiyah, Qal'at Salih and Samawah areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 1100 hours, drove them off.

(g) At 1050 hours on 27 April 2000, United States and British F-14, F-15, F-16, F-18, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Saudi and Kuwaiti territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They carried out 40 sorties, 24 from Saudi airspace and 16 from Kuwaiti airspace, supported by an AWACS command and control aircraft from inside Saudi airspace. The aircraft overflew the Salman, Jalibah, Lasaf, Basra, Nasiriyah, Qurnah, Samawah and Shinafiyah areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 1135 hours, drove them off.

(h) At 0955 hours on 28 April 2000, United States and British F-15, F-16, F-18, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Saudi and Kuwaiti territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They carried out 38 sorties, 30 from Saudi airspace and eight from Kuwaiti airspace, supported by an AWACS

command and control aircraft from inside Saudi airspace. The aircraft overflew the Salman, Ushbayjah, Nukhayb, Taqtaqanah, Nasiriyah, Diwaniyah, Najaf, Samawah and Shinafiyah areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 1100 hours, drove them off.

These acts of aggression represent the continuation of a consistent policy of hostility against Iraq that has been pursued by the United States of America and the United Kingdom since 1992 and is aimed at undermining the country's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity, deliberately and systematically bringing death to Iraq's citizens and inflicting damage upon its infrastructure and civilian installations. This policy has been confirmed by the repeated statements of United States and British officials purporting to defend the no-flight zones.

The Government of Iraq categorically rejects the so-called no-flight zones, which were imposed by the United States of America and the United Kingdom pursuant to a unilateral decision which has no legal basis or legitimacy. Iraq rejects all measures taken on the basis of this illegal decision and, in particular, the fabricated excuses and pretexts used by those two States in efforts to disguise their military aggression against our country.

The logistical support provided by Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Turkey to the United States and United Kingdom makes them full accomplices in the aggression against Iraq, and they must share international responsibility for these acts committed against the Iraqi people.

The Government of Iraq, in condemning these acts of overt aggression, requests that you intervene with the Governments of the States in question with a view to bringing a halt to such acts, which violate international law and the sovereignty of Iraq.

Accept, Sir, the assurances of my highest consideration.

(*Signed*) Mohammed Said **Al-Sahaf**
Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq

United Nations S/2000/384

Security Council

Distr.: General
4 May 2000

Original: English

Letter dated 4 May 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to draw your attention to a serious incident involving unprovoked artillery bombardment by the Indian army across the Line of Control in Chakoti Sector on 3 May 2000, resulting in the death of at least nine civilians, including three women, and injury to 11 others. Those seriously wounded also included some children.

The Indian troops opened up heavy artillery, mortar and field gunfire in the morning on villages located in Azad Jammu and Kashmir near the Line of Control. The Indian army fired about 300 rounds in two hours.

I would like to request that this letter may be circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Shamshad **Ahmad**

00-41848 (E) 050500